

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

As it is, there's so much wrong about the media's control of information that I don't even know where to begin. So I won't even start, except to say that diversity in media ownership and reporting is a saving grace that will keep Americans truly well informed, and hopefully, citizens of the world as well as the United States. Any measures designed to lessen this diversity should not be enacted - the negative effects of such actions are incalculable.

I do not believe that commercial competition is enough to ensure diversity. The "proliferation of outlets" is true enough, but only for those people lucky enough to have constant and rapid web access. Those people who don't, and those unwilling or unable to actively search out balanced international sources of information, are by default forced to rely on easily accessible news. If access to channels is primarily controlled by the "Big 5", the average American will be steered towards whatever slant/position these conglomerates choose to support. I don't think such mind control, however subtle or insidious, is in America's best interest.

I thank you for your time and consideration in reading this.